

**U.S. Department of Education - EDCAPS
G5-Technical Review Form (New)**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 9/9/11 12:00 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The College Board (U411C110176)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	
Sub Total	0	
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	35	35
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	25
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Quality of the Management	20	20
Sub Total	80	80
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 6		
Competitive Preference Priority 6		
1. Competitive Preference 6	1	
Sub Total	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 7		
Competitive Preference Priority 7		
1. Competitive Preference 7	1	
Sub Total	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 8		
Competitive Preference Priority 8		
1. Competitive Preference Pr	1	
Sub Total	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 9		
Competitive Preference Priority 9		
1. Competitive Preference 9	1	
Sub Total	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 10		
Competitive Preference Priority 10		

1. Competitive Preference 10	1	1
Sub Total	1	1
Total	85	81

Technical Review Form

Panel #30 - 84.411C Panel - 30: 84.411C

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: The College Board (U411C110176)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. The Secretary considers the need for the project. In determining the need for the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

(2) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

(3) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that, if funded, the proposed project likely will have a positive impact, as measured by the importance or magnitude of the effect, on improving student achievement or student growth, closing achievement gaps, decreasing dropout rates, increasing high school graduation rates, or increasing college enrollment and completion rates.

Strengths:

This project proposes an innovative technology-based interim assessment and high quality feedback system for Advanced Placement Biology which meets Absolute Priority three with a goal of addressing weakness in STEM college readiness of high-need students. Large numbers of these students have been encouraged to take high standard AP courses in high school but have not met the qualifying score level to gain college credit and improve outcomes. A major strength of the system is the direct link to online instructional resources for remediation and enrichment from the student level feedback report. In order to improve levels of effective teaching in AP, an identified need, the program gives teachers online tools through feedback reports and appropriate professional development to assist them in differentiating instruction which is important (e25-28). Overall the feedback system appears to have potential to provide the scaffolding required to increase learning among all students and incrementally raise levels of college readiness and completion.

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with actions that are
(a) aligned with the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet, and
(b) expected to result in achieving the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

(2) The eligible applicant's estimate of the cost of the proposed project, which includes the start up and operating costs per student per year (including indirect costs) for reaching the total number of students proposed to be served by the project. The eligible applicant must include an estimate of the costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students.

Note: The Secretary considers cost estimates both

(a) to assess the reasonableness of the costs relative to the objectives, design, and potential significance for the total number of students to be served by the proposed project, which is determined by the eligible applicant, and
(b) to understand the possible costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach the scaling targets of 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students for Development grants. An eligible applicant is free to propose how many students it will serve under its project, and is expected to reach that number of students by the end of the grant period. The scaling targets, in contrast, are theoretical and allow peer reviewers to assess the cost-effectiveness generally of proposed projects, particularly in cases where initial investment may be required to support projects that operate at reduced cost in the future, whether implemented by the eligible applicant or any other entity. Grantees are not required to reach these numbers during the grant period.

(3) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.

(4) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the eligible applicant and any other partners at the end of the Development grant.

Strengths:

Goals, objectives and outcomes are clearly delineated in the table on pages e33-34. These expectations seem reasonable.

The College Board has a high level of respect in the education field due to the quality and quantity of work produced. It is reasonable to expect that AP exam fees will support the scale-up of AP Innovation and the SSAP-Bio as planned (e38). It is important that The College Board plan includes scaling up to all AP Biology students around the country (e45) as well as scaling up the model to other AP STEM subjects (e48).

Upfront platform development and integration costs seem high but reach a reasonable level of per student expense (e37, e171).

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks, as well as tasks related to the sustainability and scalability of the proposed project.

(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director and key project personnel, especially in managing projects of the size and scope of the proposed project.

Strengths:

The management plan (e175-180) is well developed and includes timelines and activities. The project co-directors, project lead, and technology lead are College Board management with a depth of experience and a high level of accomplishment in their areas of expertise. The district (LEA) project directors as well as the evaluators are highly qualified for this project (Appendix F).

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 6 - Competitive Preference Priority 6

1. Competitive Preference Priority 6 - Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (zero or one point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve educational outcomes for high-need students who are young children (birth through 3rd grade) by enhancing the quality of early learning programs. To meet this priority, applications must focus on

(a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);

(b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and

(c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority 7 - Competitive Preference Priority 7

1. Competitive Preference Priority 7 - Innovations that Support College Access and Success (zero or one point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to enable kindergarten through grade 12 (K-12) students, particularly high school students, to successfully prepare for, enter, and graduate from a two- or four-year college. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs for K-12 students that

(a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;

(b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and

(c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority 8 - Competitive Preference Priority 8

1. Competitive Preference Priority 8 - Innovations to Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students with Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (zero or one point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to address the unique learning needs of students with disabilities, including those who are assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, or the linguistic and academic needs of limited English proficient students. To meet this priority, applications must provide for the implementation of particular practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve academic outcomes, close achievement gaps, and increase college- and career-readiness, including increasing high school graduation rates (as defined in this notice), for students with disabilities or limited English proficient students.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority 9 - Competitive Preference Priority 9

1. Competitive Preference Priority 9 - Improving Productivity (zero or one point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to significantly increase efficiency in the use of time, staff, money, or other resources while improving student learning or other educational outcomes (i.e., outcome per unit of resource). Such projects may include innovative and sustainable uses of technology, modification of school schedules and teacher compensation systems,

use of open educational resources (as defined in this notice), or other strategies.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority 10 - Competitive Preference Priority 10

1. Competitive Preference Priority 10 - Technology (zero or one point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to improve student achievement or teacher effectiveness through the use of high-quality digital tools or materials, which may include preparing teachers to use the technology to improve instruction, as well as developing, implementing, or evaluating digital tools or materials.

Strengths:

The use of a technology platform to deliver online, dynamic classroom and individual student feedback and intervention strategies to AP Biology students and teachers is well designed to increase student mastery and teacher effectiveness. A strength is the integration of the project into AP Innovation which produces a seamless environment for users (e34-36). A significant aspect of the project is the provision for an investment in a usability study of the technology platform components. Especially notable is the inclusion of students as well as teachers in the study (e176). This study should ensure the ease of use for teachers and students and the quality of the site.

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 9/9/11 12:00 AM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 9/9/11 12:00 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The College Board (U411C110176)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	
Sub Total	0	
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	35	35
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	25
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Quality of the Management	20	20
Sub Total	80	80
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 6		
Competitive Preference Priority 6		
1. Competitive Preference 6	1	
Sub Total	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 7		
Competitive Preference Priority 7		
1. Competitive Preference 7	1	
Sub Total	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 8		
Competitive Preference Priority 8		
1. Competitive Preference Pr	1	
Sub Total	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 9		
Competitive Preference Priority 9		
1. Competitive Preference 9	1	
Sub Total	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 10		
Competitive Preference Priority 10		

1. Competitive Preference 10	1	1
Sub Total	1	1
Total	85	81

Technical Review Form

Panel #30 - 84.411C Panel - 30: 84.411C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: The College Board (U411C110176)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. The Secretary considers the need for the project. In determining the need for the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

(2) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

(3) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that, if funded, the proposed project likely will have a positive impact, as measured by the importance or magnitude of the effect, on improving student achievement or student growth, closing achievement gaps, decreasing dropout rates, increasing high school graduation rates, or increasing college enrollment and completion rates.

Strengths:

This proposal is an exceptional approach to Absolute Priority 3 as it addresses the need to increase high-need students' success in academically rigorous courses by developing and using formative and interim assessments aligned to AP Biology and providing teacher professional development that will use assessment information to inform classroom practice.

The proposal clearly delineates high-need student gaps in achievement in academic rigorous courses (AP Biology) (p. e28), the lack of feedback to address specific challenging areas of the course (p. e29), and the inequitable access of high-needs students to high-quality, differentiated instruction (p. e29). Expanding access to AP courses for high-need students requires professional development for AP teachers, especially in the area of differentiated instruction. AP teachers have, in the past, faced homogeneous groups of students and did not need to design differentiated instruction. In order to expand access, teachers need to be better able to diagnose individual student's needs and design instruction that meets those needs. Furthermore, high-need students are frequently taught by less qualified teachers who would benefit from specific and targeted professional development as outlined in this proposal.

As success in AP courses predicts improved student outcomes in college (credits and grades earned, graduation rates, etc.), improved achievement in those course should improve college readiness and success. This proposal includes several strengths to address this. Feedback reports from both formative and interim assessments that are tailored to instruction (p. e31) will provide relevant, specific and understandable information to both students and teachers. The immediacy of this feedback is particularly important to the success of low-achieving students. The provision for professional development, both face-to-face and on-site, that includes the creation of structured Professional Learning Communities, on-line modules and on-line

collaboration opportunities aligns with research regarding successful professional development (pp. e162-3). The proposal clearly identifies the positive impact anticipated by the project (p.e33) and supports the magnitude of those predicted effects with relevant research (pp. e29-32).

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with actions that are
(a) aligned with the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet, and
(b) expected to result in achieving the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

(2) The eligible applicant's estimate of the cost of the proposed project, which includes the start up and operating costs per student per year (including indirect costs) for reaching the total number of students proposed to be served by the project. The eligible applicant must include an estimate of the costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students.

Note: The Secretary considers cost estimates both

(a) to assess the reasonableness of the costs relative to the objectives, design, and potential significance for the total number of students to be served by the proposed project, which is determined by the eligible applicant, and
(b) to understand the possible costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach the scaling targets of 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students for Development grants. An eligible applicant is free to propose how many students it will serve under its project, and is expected to reach that number of students by the end of the grant period. The scaling targets, in contrast, are theoretical and allow peer reviewers to assess the cost-effectiveness generally of proposed projects, particularly in cases where initial investment may be required to support projects that operate at reduced cost in the future, whether implemented by the eligible applicant or any other entity. Grantees are not required to reach these numbers during the grant period.

(3) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.

(4) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the eligible applicant and any other partners at the end of the Development grant.

Strengths:

The Project Design clearly and strongly supports the goal of the proposed project. The goal is clearly stated (p.e33) and the objectives and expected outcomes are well articulated (pp. e33-34). The project activities are logically sequenced to ensure success. The plan to design online teacher feedback reports that aggregate student data, to provide user-friendly visual reports, and to group students for differentiated instruction will enable teachers to meet the needs of high-need students. Furthermore, the project proposes to design on-line student feedback based on the results of interim assessments. This will support student achievement by outlining a learning plan for each student, show his/her progress and indicate steps the student needs to take for success. This type of timely and meaningful feedback for both teachers and students is well-supported by research.

The inclusion of all stakeholders in multiple aspects of the project is a great strength. The feasibility studies involving teachers and students (The Catalyst Group p. e171) will ensure that site integration and feedback

reporting are user-friendly and user-valued. Providing funds for substitute teachers so that teachers can attend professional development, as well as providing honoraria for teachers and students to participate in discussion of the project as it unfolds, honors and values their participation in the project. In addition, administrators will receive professional development to be able to access and interpret reports. The use of external advisors will also provide informed input from leading experts in relevant fields.

Although the development cost per student is substantial, it is not unreasonable for the objectives, design and potential significance of this project. Sustainability is designed into the plan as The College Board already supports the implementation of AP Biology nationwide. The estimate of costs to scale the project for larger populations is extremely reasonable (p. e37) and should not present a barrier to dissemination.

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

(1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks, as well as tasks related to the sustainability and scalability of the proposed project.

(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director and key project personnel, especially in managing projects of the size and scope of the proposed project.

Strengths:

The Management Plan is appropriate and designed to support the successful implementation of the proposed project. College Board staff and LEA District Program Directors will form the Leadership Team. This sharing of leadership between The College Board and the LEAs will provide a strong link and create shared vision and responsibility. The design of the LEA Operating Team includes appropriate personnel to guide implementation in each district; including embedded College Board staff will provide an excellent route for communication between the LEAs and the applicant. The milestones outlined on p. e45 are reasonable and will provide excellent benchmarks for progress in the project. The choices of LEA District Project Directors (p. e50) are appropriate; project management falls well within their areas of expertise and responsibility.

In particular, the proposal includes good data describing the student population (p. e80), a good research base to guide management decisions, and a very detailed and clear budget narrative (pp. e170-183) that will drive fiscal accountability. The project director and key project personnel have strong educational backgrounds and extensive successful experiences in managing projects of this size and scope.

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 6 - Competitive Preference Priority 6

1. Competitive Preference Priority 6 - Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (zero or one point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve educational outcomes for high-need students who are young children (birth through 3rd grade) by enhancing the quality of early learning programs. To meet this priority, applications must focus on

(a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);

(b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and

(c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority 7 - Competitive Preference Priority 7

1. Competitive Preference Priority 7 - Innovations that Support College Access and Success (zero or one point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to enable kindergarten through grade 12 (K-12) students, particularly high school students, to successfully prepare for, enter, and graduate from a two- or four-year college. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs for K-12 students that

(a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;

(b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and

(c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority 8 - Competitive Preference Priority 8

1. Competitive Preference Priority 8 - Innovations to Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students with Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (zero or one point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to address the unique learning needs of students with disabilities, including those who are assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, or the linguistic and academic needs of limited English proficient students. To meet this priority, applications must provide for the implementation of particular practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve academic outcomes, close achievement gaps, and increase college- and career-readiness, including increasing high school graduation rates (as defined in this notice), for students with disabilities or limited English proficient students.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority 9 - Competitive Preference Priority 9

1. Competitive Preference Priority 9 - Improving Productivity (zero or one point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to significantly increase efficiency in the use of time, staff, money, or other resources while improving student learning or other educational outcomes (i.e., outcome per unit of resource). Such projects may include innovative and sustainable uses of technology, modification of school schedules and teacher compensation systems, use of open educational resources (as defined in this notice), or other strategies.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority 10 - Competitive Preference Priority 10

1. Competitive Preference Priority 10 - Technology (zero or one point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to improve student achievement or teacher effectiveness through the use of high-quality digital tools or materials, which may include preparing teachers to use the technology to improve instruction, as well as developing,

**implementing, or evaluating
digital tools or materials.**

Strengths:

This proposal is designed to improve high-need student achievement and teacher effectiveness in implementing AP Biology. These goals will be achieved by the use of high-quality digital tools that will provide real-time, affordable, efficient and accessible on-line support to both students and teachers. The system will identify individual student challenge areas through analysis of formative and interim assessments and provide targeted remedial learning resources to support student success. It will also create classroom reports and provide links to materials, resources (such as an online library of formative assessments in challenging areas and video exemplars of expert teachers using these assessments), and professional development for teachers to design effective differentiated instruction to students. In addition, the technology platform will provide an on-line collaboration and social networking center to support AP Biology teachers. Thus high-need student achievement and teacher effectiveness will be improved.

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 9/9/11 12:00 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 9/10/11 12:00 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The College Board (U411C110176)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	
Sub Total	0	
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	35	33
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	23
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Quality of the Management	20	20
Sub Total	80	76
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 6		
Competitive Preference Priority 6		
1. Competitive Preference 6	1	
Sub Total	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 7		
Competitive Preference Priority 7		
1. Competitive Preference 7	1	
Sub Total	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 8		
Competitive Preference Priority 8		
1. Competitive Preference Pr	1	
Sub Total	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 9		
Competitive Preference Priority 9		
1. Competitive Preference 9	1	
Sub Total	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 10		
Competitive Preference Priority 10		

1. Competitive Preference 10

1

1

Sub Total

1

1

Total

85

77

Technical Review Form

Panel #30 - 84.411C Panel - 30: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: The College Board (U411C110176)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. The Secretary considers the need for the project. In determining the need for the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

(2) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

(3) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that, if funded, the proposed project likely will have a positive impact, as measured by the importance or magnitude of the effect, on improving student achievement or student growth, closing achievement gaps, decreasing dropout rates, increasing high school graduation rates, or increasing college enrollment and completion rates.

Strengths:

One of the strengths that characterizes this proposal is the depth of research presented in this section. The applicant provides a substantial array of empirical support as well as advocacy/position papers to demonstrate that the project is needed (pp. e26 -27) and also that the project represents an exceptional approach to meeting the needs that they have identified. Anchoring the approach that they take in the NRF guidelines (p. e26) provides compelling evidence that the needs they identify and remedial actions they propose are in keeping with the trends in science education.

The gaps in current practice that the proposal addresses most directly are related to the need for formative evaluation tools in academic subjects, including AP classes (p. e31). The project has a very good chance of closing the achievement gaps that are noted in the introduction, and subsequently, increasing college enrollment and completion rates. The research base that the applicant provides on page e 31 has been replicated with students with disabilities as well as students without disabilities who are characterized as having low achievement. Other work with continuous progress measures yields effect sizes in the range of 0.50 predicted in the proposal (many are in the range of .7) so the project has potential to deliver an effect of notable magnitude.

Weaknesses:

The project proposes to work directly with 5500 students (p. e18). Given a population of that size, individuals with disabilities who have active IEPs are very likely to be included in the group of research participants. This population may require specific adaptations in presentation, communication, timing, etc, but no mention of how such considerations will be handled appears in the proposal.

Reader's Score: 33

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with actions that are
(a) aligned with the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet, and
(b) expected to result in achieving the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

(2) The eligible applicant's estimate of the cost of the proposed project, which includes the start up and operating costs per student per year (including indirect costs) for reaching the total number of students proposed to be served by the project. The eligible applicant must include an estimate of the costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students.

Note: The Secretary considers cost estimates both

(a) to assess the reasonableness of the costs relative to the objectives, design, and potential significance for the total number of students to be served by the proposed project, which is determined by the eligible applicant, and
(b) to understand the possible costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach the scaling targets of 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students for Development grants. An eligible applicant is free to propose how many students it will serve under its project, and is expected to reach that number of students by the end of the grant period. The scaling targets, in contrast, are theoretical and allow peer reviewers to assess the cost-effectiveness generally of proposed projects, particularly in cases where initial investment may be required to support projects that operate at reduced cost in the future, whether implemented by the eligible applicant or any other entity. Grantees are not required to reach these numbers during the grant period.

(3) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.

(4) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the eligible applicant and any other partners at the end of the Development grant.

Strengths:

The project contains clear goals as well as strategies and time limes for meeting them (pp. e33 - e34). The AP Innovation Model proposed for the project is clear and supported with sufficient efficacy data to support each of its components (Appendix J, pp. e153 -154). Given the absence of tangible, easily accessible and valid formative assessment tools for AP classes, the goals of the project are quite ambitious and will require a substantial amount of work. The effort required to develop and validate these measures justifies the costs of the project. The well-designed research component is an important aspect of the entire project and research of the quality described here is expensive. Additionally, once developed, the measures can be scaled to larger populations and made available as stand-alone assessments or embedded in specific curricula, thereby promoting the continuation of the activities after the funding period.

Weaknesses:

The actions proposed are described in moderate detail in Appendix J but an example or two of the kinds of assessments and reporting formats that are likely to be examined for the project would make the proposal stronger and the actions more concrete.

Reader's Score: 23

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

(1) **The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks, as well as tasks related to the sustainability and scalability of the proposed project.**

(2) **The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director and key project personnel, especially in managing projects of the size and scope of the proposed project.**

Strengths:

The management plan presents clear designations of responsibility and target dates for completion of each step. The concrete descriptions of the actions and target dates along with the responsible parties on pages e48 and e49 is a strength for the application and suggests that the project can be carried out according to the timelines proposed and within budget. The project leadership personnel and consultants described on pages e49 and e59 and continuing with external advisors on pages e51 and e52 clearly possess the qualifications and experience to carry out a project of this scope and magnitude.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions**Competitive Preference Priority 6 - Competitive Preference Priority 6**

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 6 - Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (zero or one point)**

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve educational outcomes for high-need students who are young children (birth through 3rd grade) by enhancing the quality of early learning programs. To meet this priority, applications must focus on

(a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);

(b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and

(c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority 7 - Competitive Preference Priority 7

1. Competitive Preference Priority 7 - Innovations that Support College Access and Success (zero or one point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to enable kindergarten through grade 12 (K-12) students, particularly high school students, to successfully prepare for, enter, and graduate from a two- or four-year college. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs for K-12 students that

(a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;

(b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and

(c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority 8 - Competitive Preference Priority 8

1. Competitive Preference Priority 8 - Innovations to Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students with Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (zero or one point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to address the unique learning needs of students with disabilities, including those who are assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, or the linguistic and academic needs of limited English proficient students. To meet this priority, applications must provide for the implementation of particular practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve academic outcomes, close achievement gaps, and increase college- and career-readiness, including increasing high school graduation rates (as defined in this notice), for students with disabilities or limited English proficient students.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority 9 - Competitive Preference Priority 9

1. Competitive Preference Priority 9 - Improving Productivity (zero or one point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to significantly increase efficiency in the use of time, staff, money, or other resources while improving student learning or other educational outcomes (i.e., outcome per unit of resource). Such projects may include innovative and sustainable uses of technology, modification of school schedules and teacher compensation systems, use of open educational resources (as defined in this notice), or other strategies.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority 10 - Competitive Preference Priority 10

1. Competitive Preference Priority 10 - Technology (zero or one point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to improve student achievement or teacher effectiveness through the use of high-quality digital tools or materials, which may include preparing teachers to use the technology to improve instruction, as well as developing, implementing, or evaluating digital tools or materials.

Strengths:

The project is well-designed to prepare teachers to use the technology to improve instruction by implementing a set of digital tools for evaluation and feedback.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: **1**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 9/10/11 12:00 AM